

Appln No. 10/727245
Amdt. Dated: August 22, 2006
Response to Office Action of July 10, 2006

3

AUG 24 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's Office Action of July 10, 2006 the Applicant respectfully submits the Amendment to the claims and the below Remarks.

Regarding Amendment

In the Amendment:

independent claim 1 is amended to clarify that each of the printhead modules which are arranged adjacent one another to form the claimed printhead having different printing widths, such that the printer controller is configured to order and time the supply of dot data to the modules in order to compensate for this difference in the printing widths. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in section 7.1.2 entitled "Bi-Lithic Printhead" at page 28, in section 9.1 entitled "Printing Rates" at page 42 and in sections 32.3, 32.4 and 32.4.1 respectively entitled "Data Rate Equalization", "Dot Generate and Transmit Order" and "Dual Printhead IC" at pages 525-528 of the present specification;

claims 5, 7 and 8 are cancelled; and

dependent claims 2-4 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments do not add new matter to the present application.

Regarding Non-Statutory Double Patenting Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that pending (and above-discussed amended) independent claim 1 is patentably distinct from pending independent claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/727,163, because the differences between these claims is more than just "a printer controller being configured to order and time supply of dot data to the printhead modules" and a printer controller "being configurable during or after manufacture to order and supply of dot data to the printhead modules" as purported by the Examiner.

That is, pending (and above-discussed amended) independent claim 1 clearly recites that the printer controller is configured to compensate for the different relative printing widths of the printhead modules. On the other hand, pending independent claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/727,163 clearly recites that the printer controller is

Appn No. 10/727245
Amdt. Dated: August 22, 2006
Response to Office Action of July 10, 2006

4

configurable to compensate for any relative displacement between the nozzles of the printhead modules in a direction normal to the printhead printing width.

Thus, the subject matter of the claims of the present application and copending Application No. 10/727,163 is entirely different and therefore patentably distinct.

Regarding 35 USC 102(e) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of above-discussed amended independent claim 1 and claim 2 dependent therefrom is not disclosed by newly cited Haflinger et al. (US 2002/0180816), for at least the following reasons.

In the present invention, as clearly recited in amended independent claim 1, the printhead is formed by abutting printhead ICs of different widths to extend across the required printing width, e.g., A4. The combination of different width printhead ICs enables the construction of various width printheads using pre-manufactured printhead ICs. In use however, the order of and time for the transfer of print data to the different width printhead ICs is different, such that for the printhead to appear continuous across its printing width, the printer controller is configured to compensate for this difference (see section 7.1.2 entitled “Bi-Lithic Printhead” at page 28, section 9.1 entitled “Printing Rates” at page 42 and sections 32.3, 32.4 and 32.4.1 respectively entitled “Data Rate Equalization”, “Dot Generate and Transmit Order” and “Dual Printhead IC” at pages 525-528 of the present specification).

On the other hand, Haflinger merely discloses constructing a print head by vertically offsetting two print heads 1, 2 of equal width with an overlap therebetween to increase swath height, and is directed to compensating for misalignments between the overlapping nozzles of the print heads 1, 2 (see paragraphs [0007], [0008], [0029], [0030] and [0034] of Haflinger).

Thus, Haflinger does not disclose, nor suggests, arranging print heads of different widths adjacent one another and configuring a printer controller to compensate for the different widths, as required by amended independent claim 1.

Therefore, the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-4 dependent therefrom, is not disclosed or suggested by Haflinger.

Appln No. 10/727245
Amdt. Dated: August 22, 2006
Response to Office Action of July 10, 2006

5

Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections

Regarding Claims 3 and 4

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claims 3 and 4 is not taught or suggested by newly cited Haflinger in view of previously cited Hackleman and/or Kamoshida, for at least the above-discussed reasons and those discussed by the Applicant in the Replies to the previous Office Actions.

Regarding Claims 5, 7 and 8

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 5, 7 and 8 over Teshigawara in view of Noyes and Oshima, based on the above-discussed amendment cancelling these claims.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Simon Robert Walmsley



Richard Thomas Plunkett

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762